

Appl. No. 10/809,534  
Examiner: Sever, Andrew T, Art Unit 2851  
In response to the Office Action dated February 15, 2006

Date: June 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 10113971

## REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on February 15, 2006 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### Present Status of Application

Claims 1-7, 14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,636,339) in view of Aubuchon (US 6,900,922). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Aubuchon and in further view of Roddy et al (US 6,882,356). Claims 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Aubuchon and in further view of Slobodin (US 2005/0062944). Claim 10, 11 and 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations recited in original claims 9 and 10. Claim 21 is added comprising all limitations recited in original claims 1 and 15. Claim 22 is added comprising all limitations recited in original claims 1 and 16. Claim 23 is added comprising all limitations recited in original claims 1 and 17. Claims 9 and 10 are canceled without prejudice. Thus, on entry of this amendment, claims 1-8 and 11-23 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication in the Office Action that claims 10, 11 and 15-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Appl. No. 10/809,534  
Examiner: Sever, Andrew T, Art Unit 2851  
In response to the Office Action dated February 15, 2006

Date: June 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 10113971

As noted above, each of the independent claims remaining in the application includes the limitations of claim 1 and one or more of claims 10, 11 and 15-17. Applicant therefore submits that all claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero  
Reg. No. 52,143  
Customer No. 34,283  
Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P118062NAQ